



California
State
University,
Fresno

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 23, 2017

TO: Faculty
Department of Biology

FROM: Lynnette Zelezny *Lynnette Zelezny*
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Approval of your revised Departmental Policy on Peer
Evaluations and Student Course Evaluations (RE: APM 322)

I have received and reviewed your revised departmental peer review documents, and they are approved for implementation.

I want to reiterate my commitment to our Academic Senate's stated beliefs that student feedback is best viewed from a multi-year perspective, and considered within the larger context of all evidence in support of a colleague's teaching effectiveness.

c: Dean, College of Science and Mathematics
Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs

Office of Provost and Vice President
For Academic Affairs
Harold H. Haak Administrative Center
Henry Madden Library
5200 North Barton Avenue, MS ML55
Fresno, CA 93740-8014

Phone: 559.278.3027
Fax: 559.278.8190

www.fresnostate.edu

Department of Biology Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

APM 322 is the official policy on the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (along with supplementary sections APM 322a-f). The Department of Biology designed this policy to further define requirements at the Departmental level as specified in APM 322.

Student Ratings of Instruction

Each faculty member except probationary faculty shall have a minimum of two courses/sections rated by students annually, unless the Chair of the Department, or his designee, decides that additional evaluations are required. Probationary faculty shall have every course rated.

While the IDEA Short Form will be the standard paper instrument for the campus, faculty may elect to use either the Diagnostic Form or the On-line version.

Faculty must fill out the Faculty Information Form by the deadline each semester in order to have each course's questions rated appropriately for that course. Other deadlines for administration of the evaluation set by the University will be followed.

Student ratings of instruction shall be assessed to identify patterns and trends of teaching performance and effectiveness. It is expected that the faculty member's scores shall at a minimum fall into the "gray area" on the Short Report Form (which designates the middle 40% of responses in the IDEA database, from 30% to 70%) using adjusted or unadjusted scores, whichever are higher. This typically corresponds to an average score of 3.5 on a 5-point scale. This goal may be adjusted as our experience with the IDEA instrument increases. The department recognizes that it is important to evaluate teaching effectiveness on a multi-year basis rather than focusing on a single course or a narrow time frame.

Peer Evaluations

Peer Evaluation Instrument

The peer evaluation instrument approved by the Department of Biology is in Appendix I. This instrument will be discussed by the Chair with all department faculty members when they are approved (individually or in groups), and with all new faculty before they are evaluated, so that all faculty members are familiar with what will be evaluated.

Frequency. Typical frequencies are listed, below. The Chair of the Department, or his designee, may decide that additional evaluations are required.

- a. For part-time temporary faculty, the first time a course is taught by the instructor and, thereafter, at least one section every other year of employment regardless of a break in service.
 1. The Department Chair will prepare a rotation schedule including all tenured and tenure-track faculty, and each semester, faculty members will be chosen from that list to evaluate one part-time faculty member's course for all part-time faculty peer evaluations
 2. Formal evaluation committees will be formed when a Range Elevation is sought.
 3. All submitted evaluations are considered when making contract decisions.

- b. For full-time lecturers, two sections each semester for the first year and two sections each academic year thereafter.
 1. The Department Chair makes periodic evaluations of lecturer performance.
 2. Formal evaluation committees are formed when a Range-Elevation is sought. Range-elevation review committee members are expected to make at least two peer evaluations of lecturer performance.
 3. Tenure and tenure-track faculty members perform periodic evaluations when asked to do so by the Lecturer or Department Chair.
 4. All submitted evaluations are considered when making contract decisions.
- c. Tenured and tenure-track faculty will be evaluated as indicated below on a rotating basis such that during a five-year period the maximum number of different courses is evaluated.

Peer Evaluations for Probationary Faculty:

1. The RTP Mentoring Committee members (3) are each expected to perform evaluations for at least one class per semester. Therefore, ordinarily there are six reviews per faculty per year but may be less depending upon teaching load and WTU distribution.
2. As the RTP Committee making formal decisions consists of all tenured faculty in the department, it is not uncommon for any number of the tenured faculty to submit evaluations. There is no regularity to this latter type of evaluation.
3. All submitted evaluations are considered when making retention, tenure and promotion decisions.

Peer Evaluations of Tenured Faculty:

1. Faculty members with a rank of less than Professor are reviewed periodically during the years following tenure. The average in the early years following tenure is one-two evaluations per year.
 2. During the latter years before a promotional decision is sought, a review committee chair is designated to encourage all faculty with the rank of Professor to perform evaluations. The average in the latter years is three-six evaluations per year.
 3. All submitted evaluations are considered when making promotion decisions.
 4. Faculty members with a rank of Professor are reviewed when the Chair of the Department, or his designee, decides that additional evaluations are required.
2. Faculty will use the attached Departmentally approved form (see Appendix 1) to evaluate Course Content, Instructional Design, Instructional Delivery and Assessment methods.
 3. The evaluator shall perform a face-to-face real time peer observation as part of the peer.

Overall

The Department of Biology will follow the guidelines in APM 325, APM 327 and APM 328 when electing committees selected to prepare the overall evaluation of teaching.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Information obtained from peer evaluations and/or student rating questionnaires shall be confidential. Possession or use of this information shall be restricted to:

1. The instructor, who may at his/her discretion, make such information available to others.
2. Those charged with administering this policy.
3. Those with access to the Open Personnel File.

Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching

<i>Instructor</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Course</i>	<i>Time</i>

This form may be used for lectures, lab introductions, and other teaching that reflects the classroom abilities of the instructor. Please respond to each question by marking the appropriate box.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable	
Content							
Prepared							
Organized presentation							
Knowledgeable about subject							
Provided clear explanations							
Good use of examples							
Used visuals effectively							
Identified what is important							
Summarized major points							
Interaction							
Enthusiastic							
Stimulated interest and participation							
Recognized when students did not understand							
Responded helpfully to questions							
Showed concern for student learning							
<i>Evaluator</i>	<i>Instructor:</i>						

Print Sign Date Print Sign Date

Use the back of this sheet to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the presentation, suggest ways in which it could be improved, and summarize the observed abilities of the instructor.

When completed, this form is to be returned to the Biology Department office. Work with the office staff to insure that: (1) the person being evaluated receives a copy; (2) a copy is placed in the Department's files; and (3) the original is placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File (PAF) in the Dean's Office.

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Suggestions</i>
------------------	-------------------	--------------------

Summary